

Appl. No. 10/003,845  
Amdt. dated Monday, January 5, 2004  
Reply to Office action of October 3, 2003

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 12-14, 17, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Vilanilam et al No. 5,821,695. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilanilam et al.

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 19 are amended. Claim 13 is cancelled. The claims as amended are believed to distinguish over the art of record and to be inobvious from that art.

Applicants' undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on December 4, 2003, in conjunction with the parent case, application No. 09/521,805, in which the Vilanilam reference was discussed, and during which certain claim amendments were also discussed.

This continuation case was filed because applicants found that during attempts to manufacture the lamp assembly of the present invention in high volumes, gas and/or air would become trapped within the lens material during the injection molding process. While the problem was not present with all shoots of material, it was prevalent enough to make the process uneconomical for large-scale production. Applicants found that providing the apertures 18 in the circuit board would prevent gas and/or air being trapped within the lamp assembly, even when a high-speed injection molding process is used for the construction.

Vilanilam is different. Vilanilam uses an elastomer material, as the Examiner has recognized, at column 3, lines 65-67, and column 4, lines 1-27, which is injected after or

Appl. No. 10/003,845  
Amdt. dated Monday, January 5, 2004  
Reply to Office action of October 3, 2003

separately from the glass jewel 40. Vilanilam does not disclose or even vaguely address the problem that applicants' instant invention solves in that the injection molding technique will trap gas in the body of the lamp assembly lens, making the final product unsuitable for use.

Applicants' claims further distinguish from Vilanilam in that the housing and the lens assembly are of the same material. As Vilanilam states, the silicon elastomer is not the same material as the glass jewel 40. Applicants' invention does not employ any glass jewel or silicon elastomer, which could not possibly withstand the kind of impact test that applicants' invention withstands. Reference may be made to applicants' web site, [www.mongolight.com](http://www.mongolight.com), where various demonstrations of stress test and water submersion demonstrations may be viewed.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are allowable over the art of record.

As amended, the claims specifically distinguish over Vilanilam, whether that reference is considered singly or in combination with any of the other art of record. This amendment was not provided earlier because applicants sincerely believed the claims distinguish over the art of record, and to be non-obvious from that art. No further search of the Office records is necessary, and it is believed this amendment places the case in condition for allowance.

For the reasons that the claims as amended are believed to distinguish over the art of record, whether that art is considered singly or in combination, and because the claims are

Appl. No. 10/003,845  
Amdt. dated Monday, January 5, 2004  
Reply to Office action of October 3, 2003

believed to be in condition for allowance, entrance of the amendment and passage of the case to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Lionel L. Lucchesi*

Lionel L. Lucchesi, Reg. No. 25,891  
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.  
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200  
St. Louis, MO 63131  
(314) 238-2400

Date: January 5, 2004

Pag 8 of 8